DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 445 575 HE 033 149

AUTHOR Edwards, Anthony
TITLE Thoughts on "Reconsidering the Washington-Du Bois Debate: Two Black Colleges in 1910-1911" and Thoughts on "Liberalism at the Crossroads: Jimmy Carter, Joseph Califano, and Public College Desegregation."
PUB DATE 2000-03-00
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern History of Education Society (Columbia, SC, March 17-18, 2000). In: "Essays in Twentieth-Century Southern Education: Exceptionalism and Its Limits," Wayne J. Urban, Ed. New York, Garland Publishing, Inc., 1999.
PUB TYPE Book/Product Reviews (072) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Black Colleges; Black History; Black Students; Civil Rights Legislation; Higher Education; *Liberalism; Politics of Education; *Public Colleges; Racial Discrimination; *Racial Segregation; *School Desegregation; Social History
IDENTIFIERS *African Americans; Carter (Jimmy); Du Bois (W E B); Kentucky; Washington (Booker T)

ABSTRACT

These two papers offer critiques of two essays that appeared in "Essays in Twentieth-Century Southern Education: Exceptionalism and its Limits," edited by Wayne J. Urban. The first paper examines Linda Buchanan and Philo Hutcheson's interpretation of the debate which underscored the well-known conflict between Booker T. Washington-W.E.B. DuBois over the appropriate education for African Americans. Buchanan and Hutcheson put the Washington-Dubois debate in a framework that compares two former black colleges in Kentucky using the schools' 1910-1911 catalogs to examine control, cost, student life, and curriculum. This paper disputes the Buchanan-Hutcheson analysis by asking whether reality can manifests itself through one college catalog; whether it is historically accurate or dependable to examine reality as reflected through institutional documents; and whether there is any other way to portray intellectual life at these institutions. The second paper examines Wayne Urban's allegation of a lack of liberalism in the orientation and political agenda of President Jimmy Carter in his efforts toward desegregating public colleges in the south. This paper attempts to refute Urban's charge by asking who was liberal and how liberal was liberal during Carter's presidency; what could have been expected from Carter or any politician (southern or otherwise) when dealing with race and education; and what can be expected today on issues dealing with race, education, and liberalism. (Both papers contain notes.)(SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 445 575

Thoughts on
"Reconsidering the Washington-Du Bois Debate: Two Black Colleges in 1910-1911"

and

Thoughts on
"Liberalism at the Crossroads: Jimmy Carter,
Joseph Califano, and Public College Desegregation"

in
Essays in Twentieth-Century Southern Education:
Exceptionalism and Its Limits (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1999)
Edited by
Wayne J. Urban

Critiques by
Anthony Edwards
University of South Carolina

Book Review Panel:
Clint Allison, University of Tennessee
Anthony Edwards, University of South Carolina
Philo Hutcheson, Georgia State University
Joe Newman, University of South Alabama
Wayne Urban, Georgia State University

Southern History of Education Society (SHOES)
Annual Meeting
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina
March 17th and 18th, 2000

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. Edwards
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

2 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Thoughts on
"Reconsidering the Washington-Du Bois Debate: Two Black Colleges in 1910-1911"
by Linda R. Buchanan and Philo A. Hutcheson
In
Essays in Twentieth-Century Southern Education: Exceptionalism and Its Limits
Edited by Wayne Urban, 1999

Anthony Edwards
University of South Carolina

While I consider all of the essays presented in *Essays in Twentieth-Century Southern Education* very important to the field or subfield of southern educational history as stated by Wayne Urban, I will devote my comments to "Reconsidering the Washington-Du Bois Debate: Two Black Colleges in 1910-1911" by Linda Buchanan and Philo Hutcheson and "Liberalism at the Crossroads: Jimmy Carter, Joseph Califano, and Public College Desegregation" by Wayne Urban.

Wayne Urban claimed that Buchanan and Hutcheson's look at the reality of Eckstein Norton Institute and State University (former black colleges of Kentucky) reveals that the debate between Washington and Du Bois over the appropriate education for African Americans was not really a debate, but rather a series of accommodations to both emphases--industrial education and classical higher education. For Linda and Philo, here are the questions I want to raise up-front: (1) Does reality indeed manifest itself through one college catalog? (2) As historians, is it accurate or dependable to look only at reality as reflected through institutional documents? (3) Is there any other way to portray actual intellectual life at these institutions?

In their essay, the authors provide a 'Historical-Interpretation of the Washington-Du Bois Debate'. Nevertheless, I will briefly review this ideological debate and attempt to add more breadth to the issue at hand.

Lawrence Cremin in the *Foreword* to Marvin Lazerson's edited volume, *American Education in the Twentieth Century: A Documentary History*, said that education in general and schooling in particular have increasingly been viewed as devices by which the historic inequalities associated with race can be countered and a more equitable society achieved. In this collection, Lazerson attested to the tension between equality and excellence in twentieth-century American education with the forcefulness of thought and sensitivity beginning with the well-known conflict between Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois over the proper education of black Americans.[1]

It is well documented that Washington, a graduate of Hampton Institute and founder of Tuskegee Institute, in his 1903 essay, "Industrial Education for the Negro," articulated the value of an education in hard work, thrift, and occupationally useful skills--he believed to be the foundations for economic success. On the other hand, Du Bois, a graduate of Fisk University and Harvard University, in his own 1903 essay, "The Talented Tenth," defended the importance of a "Talented Tenth" to lead black Americans into full participation in American life by focusing attention on a classical curriculum in higher education. This long-standing debate is revisited by Buchanan and Hutcheson.

They compared two former black colleges of Kentucky--State University and Eckstein Norton Institute--using the schools' 1910-1911 bulletins--by reporting on control, cost, student life, and curriculum. They sought to answer the question: To what extent did each institution underscore the industrial ideal?

---

[1]See *American Education in the Twentieth Century: A Documentary History* edited by Marvin Lazerson. New York: Teachers College Press, 1987.

To add to the discussion, I will simply note that the name of the college during the 1910-1911 academic year said a great deal about their natures and ambitions. 'University' in the case of State stood for higher education, while 'Institute' in the case of Eckstein Norton identified that college with industrial education.

James Anderson wrote that Hampton Institute, however, was founded and maintained as a normal school and that its mission was the training of common school teachers for the South's black educational system. He went on to say that Hampton Institute was neither a college nor a trade school but rather a normal school composed of elementary school graduates who were seeking two additional years of schooling and teacher preparation courses so that they might qualify for a common school teaching certificate. He commented that this confusion came about because of the ideology of "self-help" (manual labor routine) as the practical and moral foundation of the teacher training process.

According to Anderson, conflict over the content and goals of black teacher training institutions emerged early in the twentieth century. Nonetheless, the trustees of Northern philanthropies were for all intents and purposes a structured governing board for the black colleges of the South. The policies they implemented, especially those approving of segregated schooling and espousing Booker T. Washington's mode of industrial education as the chief element in more advanced schooling for blacks, exerted a decisive influence on state education policies throughout the South.[2] It is noteworthy that the philanthropies of the General Education Board mounted a concerted campaign to dismantle liberal arts--higher education--instruction in

---

[2]See Lawrence A. Cremin's *American Education: The Metropolitan Experience 1876-1980*, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988.

African-American colleges and to support the Hampton Institute-Tuskegee Institute Model of industrial education for blacks.

Soon after the General Education Board was established in 1902, its agents undertook a careful inspection of the black private secondary institutions, normal schools, and colleges. The board's inspectors started in 1903 with the schools operated by the American Baptist Home Mission Society. . . .In December 1903, Wallace Buttrick filed a preliminary report on eight of the society's black colleges and noted that their major problem was too much emphasis on classical and higher literary training. For instance, Buttrick found that Leland University in New Orleans "holds too strictly to classical ideals. . .the school is not likely to take any active interest in training the Negro for productive efficiency." Any black institution emphasizing classical liberal arts education was regarded by Buttrick as impractical and not geared to prepare black youth for useful citizenship and productive skillfulness. Even those institutions offering a considerable amount of industrial education were viewed as misguided so long as the industrial training was not used primarily for the preparation of teachers.[3]

The 724-page definitive report, *Negro Education: A Study of Private and Higher Schools for Colored People in the United States*, of the U.S. Bureau of Education and the Phelps-Stokes Fund on African-American higher education, appeared at the end of 1917. Thomas Jesse Jones, the author of the General Education Board-inspired report, was a former Hampton Institute professor who had become one of the "Negro experts" consulted by the large foundations to the almost total exclusion of Du Bois and his circle. Du Bois fumed that it was not "merely a silly

---

[3]See James D. Anderson's *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988, pp. 132-133.

desire to study 'Greek,'" as Jones had repeatedly implied, that lay behind the preference for liberal arts at Atlanta University, Fisk University, Howard University, and Lincoln University.[4]

Buchanan and Hutcheson, in their comparison of State University and Eckstein Norton Institute, contend that Eckstein Norton's College Department was a preparatory department--at least as far as State University was concerned. Eckstein Norton Institute did not offer any professional study, and its College Department was not equal to that of State University. The authors go on to say that State University's curriculum combined liberal arts and industrial education as did Eckstein Norton Institute. However, it is clear from the data reported in this essay that State University aligned its studies in support of Du Bois and his mission of classical higher education for blacks. As stated by the authors, "Among colored institutions in the South, State University has been the pioneer in the matter of classical education for Negro Youth." This differed sharply from Eckstein Norton Institute which accepted students as young as nine and followed Washington's industrial education model.

To some extent the differences between Du Bois and Washington came from their addressing different constituencies, living in very different economic and social circumstances, and having correspondingly different ideological emphases in education. The vocational education that Washington promoted would have been a step backward for Du Bois' followers, as seen with students transferring from the College Department at Eckstein Norton Institute to State University. Still, Du Bois conceded that vocational education "has accomplishments of which it has a right to be proud," and conversely, Washington declared: "Get all the mental

---

[4]See *W.E.B. Du Bois: Biography of a Race* by David Levering Lewis. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1993.

development that your time and pocketbook will allow of."[5]

Buchanan and Hutcheson concluded, by looking at the 1910-1911 college catalogs for the two Kentucky schools, that there was a softening of the rigid line between Washington and Du Bois' ideological approaches to black higher education. Again I ask, can one gain true insight into the life (or reality) of an institution by looking only at its historical documents? Nevertheless, I believe that the rivalry between the two men--and between their supporters--was both real and sometimes resentful as expressed by the name each former black college took pride in--"Institute" for Eckstein Norton (underscoring Washington's Industrial Education Model) and "University" for State (underscoring Du Bois' Higher Education Model).

---

[5]See "Up From Slavery" by Thomas Sowell, Betty Franklin, and Lisa Sanders in *Forbes*, December 5, 1994, Volume 154, Number 13, pp. 84-91.

Thoughts on
"Liberalism at the Crossroads: Jimmy Carter,
Joseph Califano, and Public College Desegregation"
by
Wayne J. Urban

in
Essays in Twentieth-Century Southern Education:
Exceptionalism and Its Limits
Edited by
Wayne J. Urban

Anthony Edwards
University of South Carolina

Wayne Urban entertained the alleged lack of liberalism in the orientation and political agenda of President Jimmy Carter in his efforts toward the desegregation of public colleges in those states that were subject to the litigation involved in *Adams v. Richardson* (1973).[1] Donald Cunnigen argued that Carter's political actions reflected a form of southern liberal activity that Anthony Lake Newberry described as "mainstream liberal" action.[2] However, according to Joseph Califano, Carter and his administration were 'insufficiently liberal' on the issue of desegregation--during his term as President of the United States.

---

[1]The pursuit of the desegregation of public colleges in the states that were subject to the litigation involved in *Adams v. Richardson* (1973) and subsequent suits against various secretaries--*Adams v. Califano* (1977), *Adams v. Harris*, *Adams v. Hufstedler*, until it became *Adams v. Bell* in the 1980s, is the leading case on application of Title VI to postsecondary education.

[2]See "Jimmy Carter as Spokesman of Southern Liberalism" in Gary M. Fink and Hugh Davis Graham (Eds), The Carter Presidency: Policy Choices in the Post-New Deal Era. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, pp. 45-56.

Newberry defined the mainstream liberals as white southern liberals who felt that the best strategy for improving race relations in the South was to gradually make a change in the attitudes of the average white southerner over an extended period of time.

In this paper, Urban indicated liberalism as a commitment to civil rights as institutionalized in desegregation efforts. In his argument, Urban assumed that the pursuit of compliance with desegregation rulings was an integral part of a liberal approach to educational and social policy during Carter's presidency. Urban dealt with Carter and his administration's *Adams* efforts after Joseph Califano's departure as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is noteworthy that in his 1971 inaugural address as Governor of Georgia, Jimmy Carter, labeled a moderate democrat by some, said that the time for racial discrimination was over. In his successful bid for the democratic nomination for President and the White House, this obscure southern governor would drive around, shaking hands and saying, "Trust me." Black America did.

In 1977, the National Urban League published it second annual "State of Black America" report that described the condition of black citizens during 1976. The data showed deepened depression and hardship among blacks. Nonetheless, the most important event for blacks in 1976 was the presidential election (providing Carter with 94% of the black vote)--overall, there was confidence in political leadership as a result of Jimmy Carter's victory.[3] President Carter named more women and minorities to his administration than any previous President--setting a vigorous example of affirmative action. It is also historic that Jimmy Carter advocated the establishment of a cabinet-level Department of Education during his presidential campaign and presidency (that divided him and Secretary Califano of Health, Education, and Welfare--the "E" would be pulled out of HEW--which would not come until 1979). Even though in 1977, Rufus Miles and Kevin

---

[3]The State of Black America 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 135 914)

McIntyre claimed that the nation needed stronger leadership than was currently possible to organize the abundance of educational policies and programs.[4]

My questions for Wayne:

(1) During Carter's presidency, who was liberal and how liberal was liberal in this case?

(2) What could we have expected from Carter or any other politician (be they southern or not) when dealing with race and education?

(3) What can we expect today on issues dealing with race, education, and liberalism?

I will remark on the *Adams* litigation and its dismissal, statements about Carter and liberalism on domestic policies, and conclude as Urban has with the alleged lack of liberalism in Carter's commitment to civil rights and desegregation is unsubstantiated in this case.[5] I concur

---

[4]See *A Cabinet Department of Education* by Rufus E. Miles, Jr. and Kevin-John H. McIntyre in Educational Record, Volume 54, Number 4, pp. 207-216, 1977.

[5]I used *The Quest to Define Collegiate Desegregation: Black Colleges, Title VI Compliance, and Post-Adams Litigation* by M. Christopher Brown II, Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey, 1999 as a framework for my discussion.

In 1954, the United States Supreme Court's ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education* overturned the prevailing doctrine of separate but equal introduced by *Plessy v. Ferguson* fifty-eight years prior. By the time *Brown* was decided, many states had created dual collegiate structures of public education, most of which operated exclusively for whites in one system and blacks in the other. Although *Brown* focused national attention on desegregation in primary and secondary public education, the issue of disestablishing dual systems of public higher education would come to the forefront two years later in *Florida ex rel. Hawkins v. Board of Control* (1956). However, the pressure to dismantle dual systems of public education was not extended to higher education until the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Despite Title VI of this Act, which stated that "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, or be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance," nineteen

with Urban that the actions taken by the Carter administration in response to the *Adams* litigation represented the more liberal elements and agenda of the administration and its leader--they argued for desegregation and social policy.

In 1994, Trish Wilson asked the question "How can a state have two sets of public universities, one predominantly black and one predominantly white, and still claim to have a desegregated system of higher education?"[6] For years, southern states have answered that question by opening admissions to all applicants, regardless of race. In the 1992 *United States v. Fordice* decision, the Supreme Court ruled that open admissions wasn't enough to eliminate the vestiges of segregation. This was the first higher education desegregation case to reach the Supreme Court since the end of the *Adams* litigation in 1990.

In 1968 and 1969 the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) issued letters to ten states believed to maintain dual higher education systems. The letters required those states to draft desegregation plans that would detail how they intended to dismantle their dual systems of higher education and create one unitary system. Arkansas, Georgia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia's responses were deemed unacceptable; while Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Oklahoma merely ignored the request. When the Department failed to initiate enforcement proceedings against the defaulting states, litigation was brought against them to make sure they would. The landmark case was *Adams v. Richardson* (1972).

---

states continued to operate dual systems of public higher education.

[6]"Black colleges: Closing the gaps--Degrees of Change: The Case for Altering History" by Trish Wilson, *The News and Observer*, October 16, 1994.

In May 1970, Kenneth Adams, a black student from Mississippi, filed a class-action suit in the U.S. District Court on behalf of other college students and taxpayer plaintiffs similarly situated. The suit of Kenneth Adams and those additional plaintiffs in nine other southern border states were joined by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Legal Defense Fund in a suit against Elliot Richardson, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The case would last for twenty years before it was dismissed.

The *Adams* suit involved the stated inability of HEW to enforce Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in ten states identified by the plaintiffs as having dual systems of higher education. According to collegiate desegregation standards outlined by HEW, Title VI required both historically black and white institutions "to provide an education to all citizens without discrimination or segregation" in a "unitary system free of the vestiges of state imposed racial segregation" (*Federal Register*, Volume 43, No. 32, February 15, 1978).

The *Adams* case was dismissed by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1990 as part of the Court's ruling in the *Women's Equity Action League v. Cavazos* (1990). The enforcement of Title VI desegregation compliance plans, therefore was left to the individual states. But there was a serious fault in the Court's decision. I contend, as others have, that with *Adams* and precedent cases such as *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) there is no clear definition of desegregation and little, if any, guidance by the Supreme Court in ways of achieving justice and integration for groups harmed because of segregated education. Also, in subsequent cases (after *Adams*) such as *United States v. Fordice* (1992), the Court's opinions are full of "ambiguous concepts" regarding what is legally required and what is educationally appropriate in order to eliminate the remaining vestiges of the dual system. Nonetheless, some may argue that there was clear statutory language

in the *Adams* decision and according to the Southern Education Foundation (1995):

> The *Adams* criteria provided a working definition of desegregation, one that promised at last to provide minorities with higher education opportunities that historically had been systematically denied them. The states were to develop and implement plans to comply with the criteria. In the mid-1980s, however, the federal government de-emphasized the enforcement of *Adams* plans and the collection of relevant data to monitor states' progress in implementing these plans. (p. 13)

After two decades of *Adams* litigation, it had become obvious that many of the Court's rulings were merely procedural in nature, i.e., who should submit what to whom by when. The opinions attempted to address the substantive issues were limited to HEW guidelines or criteria for dismantling dual systems of higher education. In 1990 with the dismissal of the *Adams* litigation, the burden of developing Title VI compliance standards and defining collegiate desegregation had made little to no progress.

The significant consequence of *Adams v. Richardson* (1973) was that the southern and border states were on notice that they must eliminate the vestiges of racial dualism in higher education. Moreover, the eradication of that dualism and the desegregating of their systems were necessary in order to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. So Urban asked whether or not Carter, or any southern politician, could have acted as a consistent liberal? I agree with Urban when he responded, "Jimmy Carter's failure to successfully pursue the *Adams* case, with Joseph Califano and without him, can be best seen as part of the larger failure of political liberalism to come to terms with its own inability to implement desegregation in education

successfully. Any attempt to relate the failure to Carter's illiberalism, and by implication to his southern background, is, at best, a distortion of the situation and, at worst, an instance of regional bigotry."

Hugh Graham called Carter's Civil Rights policies disappointing. Stuart Eizenstat wrote that "the liberal community remains unreconciled to a man who did so much, considering the conservative times in which he governed...." Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., told of Jimmy Carter being the most conservative Democratic President since Grover Cleveland."[7] However, Hugh Graham comes to Carter's defense by arguing that "his presidency coincided with a conservative shift in American political life that began in the later 1960s and that spelled trouble for the leader of the party of the left whatever his civil rights policies." It is also noteworthy that Gary Reichard observed that Carter's civil rights issues "unquestionably followed the tradition of his liberal Democratic predecessors."[8]

In reference to the *Adams* case, critics of Carter and his so-called lack of liberalism in the *Adams* case should take heed to Justice Scalia in his dissenting opinion (concurring in the judgement in part) in *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.* (1989). He wrote that the majority decision is "something-for-all, guidance-to-none." He went on to predict that "there will be a number of years litigation driven confusion and destabilization in the university systems of all the formerly *de jure* States, that will benefit neither blacks nor whites, neither predominantly black

---

[7]See "President Carter, the Democratic Party, and the Making of Domestic Policy" by Stuart E. Eizenstat in Herbert D. Rosenbaum and Alexej Ugrinsky (Eds.), The Presidency and Domestic Policies of Jimmy Carter. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 17-28, 1994.

[8]See "Civil Rights Policy in the Carter Presidency" by Hugh Davis Graham in Gary M. Fink and Hugh Davis Graham (Eds), The Carter Presidency: Policy Choices in the Post-New Deal Era. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, pp. 202-223, 1998.

institutions nor predominately white ones. Nothing good will come of this judicially ordained turmoil, except the public recognition that any Court that would knowingly impose it must hate segregation. We must find some other way of making that point."